DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 737 SP 032 415

TITLE	Mentor Teacher Internship Program, 1988-89. Evaluation Section Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE	Mar 90
NOTE	53p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Internship Programs; *Mentors; Peer Teaching; *Program Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS	New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The essential feature of the Mentor Teacher Internship Program in New York City is the creation of a supportive, nonevaluative context in which an experienced mentor-teacher provides peer coaching to uncertified teachers to improve their effectiveness and increase their retention rate. This report presents the evaluation of the program by the New York City Board of Education. Following a brief program overview, chapter 2 discusses program implementation, including staff development. Findings based on the initial set of mentor/intern surveys are discussed in chapter 3. The fourth chapter presents the results of site visits. In the fifth chapter, results of the second set of mentor/intern surveys are described, as well as the surveys conducted with others connected to the program. Throughout the report, special attention is given to comparing and contrasting the responses of those mentors (n=86) who took part in the state funded model with the considerably larger number (n=456) who participated in the tax levy model. Conclusions and recommendations are contained in the final chapter. A copy of the evaluation summary is attached. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319737

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT
John Schoener, Chief Administrator
March 1990

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

Mentor Teacher Internship Program
1988-89

Prepared by
The Instructional Support Evaluation Unit

Frank Guerrero, Unit Manager
Phyllis Goldberg, Evaluation Consultant

SP032 415

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

New York City Public Schools
Division of Strategic Planning/Research and Development
Robin Willner, Executive Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Gwendolyn C. Baker
Amalia V. Betanzos
Stephen R. Franse
James F. Regan
Edward L. Sadowsky
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesheiwat, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

1/1/90

MENTOR TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Evaluation Summary, 1988-89

BACKGROUND

1988-89 marked the third year in the implementation of the Mentor Teacher Internship Program (M.T.I.P.), in which an experienced mentor teacher provides on-site peer coaching in a non-evaluative context to new, uncertified teachers. This coaching had two purposes: to improve new teachers' teaching effectiveness and to increase the retention rates of new teachers as well as the retention rates of experienced teachers. The program is a collaborative effort of the New York City Board of Education (Office of Professional Development and Leadership Training) and the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.).

Both a state-funded and a tax-levy model of the program were available to fulfill the legislatively mandated requirement that all new, uncertified teachers receive mentoring. The state-funded mentor model (employed in the 1986-87 pilot project) utilized current staff and required the mentor to be out of his/her own classroom for three periods per week to mentor one intern, or five periods per week to mentor two. Interns had to set aside five periods for mentoring, which reduced their teaching time by 20%.

Districts and high schools unable to serve some or all of their eligible interns through the state-funded model were required to use the tax-levy model. According to this model, current teachers who met the qualifications for mentors and had the same or a related license as the intern were selected as

mentors whenever scheduling and coverage permitted. Such mentors were released from their classrooms for five periods each week for each intern mentored. Interns and mentors worked together during available "directed preparation" period(s), and had at least one common conference period. In addition, the mentor visited the intern's class for two periods per week.

POPULATION SERVED

During 1988-89 a total of 1,153 mentors and 1,724 interns*, from elementary, intermediate/junior high and high schools in all 33 public school districts and all five high school superintendencies of New York City, participated in the program.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the full-year M.T.I.P. were that by June 30, 1989 new teachers (interns): 1) would have made significant performance improvement in the range, depth, and variety of their knowledge of teaching in their subject areas; 2) would demonstrate a positive view of their own competence and potential, as well as satisfaction with work skills useful for career development; and 3) would demonstrate a commitment to remaining in the public school system as a result of increased competence and confidence gained through participation in the program. In addition, mentor teachers would demonstrate effective skills gained through staff development and practical application.

*Not every intern was served for a full year.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of the program was based on several sources of data: 1) a set of mentor and intern "profiles" provided basic demographic information about the participating teachers; 2) two sets of written surveys completed by the mentors and the interns (the first one was done shortly after the program was implemented, and the second was done towards the end of the school year); 3) written questionnaires used by the mentors and interns to evaluate the staff development conference and workshops in which they participated; 4) written surveys of school principals, members of the Mentor Advisory Selection committees, U.F.T. district representatives, and district office personnel; and 5) face-to-face interviews of mentors, interns, principals, U.F.T. chapter leaders and district representatives and district office personnel conducted by a three-member research team, during site visits to a selected sample of schools and district offices in all five boroughs. Data from these sources, as well as from activity logs maintained by the mentors and interns, form the basis for this evaluation.

FINDINGS

Staff Development

Reflecting the suggestions made by program participants in earlier years, staff development tended to be more responsive and practical than before. Both mentors and interns in the state-funded as well as the tax-levy models evaluated the training they received very highly. A joint all-day orientation conference for mentors and interns held in December, 1988 received high ratings

for quality and helpfulness from both mentors and interns. A large majority of the mentors and interns continued to rate the overall quality of the ongoing staff development as "good" or "excellent."

The mentors' and interns' most frequent in-school activities were conferencing and viewing/visiting. Both activities were conducted primarily with each other. The most frequent topics of these activities were classroom management, reading, and math.

Beginning the Program

- A majority of the mentors (state-funded and tax-levy) already felt they were benefiting from the program both personally and professionally.
- Teachers' absence from their classrooms, while still an issue, was a matter of less concern than it had been in the first two years, particularly among tax-levy model mentors.
- The majority of new teachers felt positively about being interns, "very satisfied" with their mentors, and liked having a more experienced teacher visit their classrooms.
- The most commonly voiced comment on the program was "Start in September."

Summing Up

- By the time the school year was drawing to a close, the great majority of the mentors had a high regard for the M.T.I.P.
- A higher proportion of state-funded than tax-levy mentors perceived the role of the principal and other supervisory staff towards the program in a positive light.
- A high proportion of both the state-funded and the tax-levy interns felt that the program had helped them to develop effective teaching behaviors, self-confidence, and the perception that their work was valued by others.
- Mentors and interns perceived the U.F.T. as having a "low profile" in connection with the program, in contrast to the opinion of some supervisors and administrators that the M.T.I.P. was a thinly disguised union "plot" to usurp their authority.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for improving the program included the following:

- Schools and districts should continue to have the option of choosing the model (state-funded or tax-levy) that best suits their needs.
- The confidential relationship between mentors and interns should be preserved and strengthened.
- Districts should be required to program for the internship in the spring term prior to starting the program in the fall.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program Overview	1
	Program Objectives	3
	Evaluation Procedures	3
	Scope of the Report	4
II.	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	5
	Selection of Participants	5
	Mentor Profiles	6
	Intern Profiles	7
	Mentors' and Interns' Activity Logs	8
	Program Administration	9
	Staff Development	9
III.	FINDINGS OF THE FIRST SURVEY	13
	Mentors' Responses	13
	Interns' Responses	15
IV.	SITE VISITS	19
	Principals'/Assistant Principals' Comments	20
	Mentors' Comments	21
	Interns' Comments	22
	U.F.T. Chapter Leaders' Comments	23
	U.F.T. District Leaders' Comments	23
	District Officers' Comments	24
V.	SUMMING UP: FINDINGS OF THE END OF YEAR SURVEY	25
	Mentors' Responses	25
	Interns' Responses	28
	Principals' Responses	31
	M.A.S. Committee Members' Responses	31
	U.F.T. District Representatives' Responses	33
	District Officers' Responses	35
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	36
	APPENDIX A	43
	APPENDIX B	44

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program (M.T.I.P.), which began as a pilot project during the 1986-87 school year in selected Comprehensive Assessment Report (C.A.R.)-designated schools, has already become institutionalized within the New York City public school system. The essential feature of the program is the creation of a supportive, non-evaluative context in which an experienced mentor teacher provides peer coaching to uncertified teachers for the primary purpose of improving the effectiveness of new teachers and increasing their retention rate. Uncertified teachers are defined as newly hired teachers who have either completed the minimum professional education credits required for a regular license but lack student teaching or one year of teaching experience, or teachers who do not possess the minimum professional education credits required for a regular license.

The hallmarks of the M.T.I.P.--the confidentiality of the mentor-intern relationship, and an emphasis on staff development for both mentors and interns--continued to characterize the program in its third year. The program represents a collaborative effort by the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.).

Since its inception in 1986, the M.T.I.P. has made a huge quantitative leap; 2,877 experienced and "new" teachers (1,153 mentors and 1,724 interns) from elementary, intermediate/junior high and high schools in all 33 public school districts and five

high school superintendencies throughout New York City participated in the program during the 1988-89 school year.

Two models of the Mentor Teacher Internship Program were available to fulfill the legislatively mandated requirement that all new teachers receive mentoring. The state-funded mentor model (employed in the 1986-87 pilot project) utilized current staff and required the mentor to be out of his/her own classroom for three periods per week to mentor one intern, or five periods per week to mentor two. Interns had to set aside five periods for mentoring, which reduced their teaching time by 20%.

Districts and high schools unable to serve some or all of their eligible interns through the state-funded model were required to use the tax-levy model. According to this model, current teachers who met the qualifications for mentors and had the same or a related license as the intern were selected as mentors whenever scheduling and coverage permitted. Such mentors were released from their classrooms for five periods each week for each intern mentored. Mentors working with four interns (holding the same or a similar license) in one school were eligible to be full-time mentors; they were required to teach one period daily. This model allowed eligible retired teachers and retired supervisors to apply to be hired as mentors--but they could be selected only after all efforts to secure current teaching staff as mentors had been exhausted. Interns and mentors worked together during available "directed preparation" period(s), and

had at least one common conference period. In addition, the mentor visited the intern's class for two periods per week.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the full-year M.T.I.P. were that by June 30, 1989:

- new teachers (interns) will have made significant performance improvement in the range, depth, and variety of their knowledge of teaching in their subject areas;
- new teachers (interns) will demonstrate a positive view of their own competence and potential, as well as satisfaction with work skills useful for career development;
- new teachers (interns) will demonstrate a commitment to remaining in the public school system as a result of increased competence and confidence gained through participation in the M.T.I.P.; and
- mentor teachers will demonstrate effective skills developed through staff development and practical application.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In order to obtain a "before and after" picture of the program from the point of view of its key participants, two sets of surveys of the mentors and the interns were conducted. The first survey was done shortly after the program was implemented in the winter of 1988-89, and the second was done towards the end of the school year. Mentors and interns were also asked to evaluate, in written questionnaires, the staff development workshops and conferences in which they participated. Another series of one-time-only surveys was conducted of school principals, members of mentor advisory selection committees, U.F.T. district representatives, and district office representatives.

In addition, in-depth, face-to-face interviews with mentors, interns, principals, U.F.T. chapter leaders and district office personnel were conducted by a three-member evaluation team during site visits to a selected sample of schools and district offices in all five boroughs. Data from these sources, as well as from activity logs maintained by the mentors and interns, form the basis for this evaluation.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report presents, in six chapters, the evaluation by the Board of Education's Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) of the M.T.I.P. for the 1988-89 school year. Program implementation, including staff development, is discussed in the next chapter. Findings based on the initial set of mentor/intern surveys are discussed in Chapter III. The fourth chapter presents the results of the site visits. Chapter V describes the results of the second set of mentor/intern surveys, as well as the surveys conducted with others connected to the program. Throughout the report, special attention is given to comparing and contrasting the responses of those who took part in the state-funded model with those (a considerably smaller number) who participated in the tax-levy model. Conclusions and recommendations are contained in the final chapter.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

As it was last year, the Mentor Teacher Internship Program was a component of the Comprehensive Professional Development program mandated by the State Commissioner of Education for all new uncertified teachers.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The Commissioner's regulations mandate that mentoring be provided by individuals with permanent certification. Whenever possible, the experienced teacher should be certified in the same or related subject area in which the uncertified teacher is employed. According to the regulations, mentors must have "a mastery of pedagogical and subject matter skills, good interpersonal qualities, and sensitivity toward the complexities of the classroom."

Mentors selected from current teaching staff had to have a minimum of five years of successful teaching experience in the New York City public schools. If all efforts to secure current teaching staff as mentors had failed, retired teachers could be selected as mentors (for the tax-levy model) on the condition that they had been retired within the previous five years.

The selection of elementary and junior high school mentors was district-based. Final selection of mentors was made by the district superintendents from approved applicants forwarded by a Mentor Advisory Selection (M.A.S.) committee comprised of a majority of teachers and including the Superintendent's designee, the District Administrator of Special Education, principals, the

U.F.T. district representative, U.F.T. chapter leaders, and a representative of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators (C.S.A.). Recommendations were then sent to the Superintendent for final selection.

The high school mentor selection process was school-based. The M.A.S. committee also was required to be comprised of a majority of teachers and to include the Superintendent's designee, the U.F.T. high school district representative, the assistant principal (A.P.) of Administration, the A.P. of Supervision, and the U.F.T. chapter leader. All uncertified teachers were eligible to participate as interns in the M.T.I.P.

MENTOR PROFILES

The following portrait of the mentors who participated in the 1988-89 M.T.I.P. is based on a questionnaire returned by 550 mentors.

Profile of Mentors Surveyed by Model, 1988-89[a]

Model Characteristics	Tax-levy (N = 456)	State-funded (N = 86)
Percentage Retired	32%	4%
Percentage with a Common Branch License	39%[b]	55%[b]
Percentage Women	74%	85%
Percentage Teaching for Eight Years or More	80%	79%
Percentage with a Master's Degree plus 30 College Credits	61%	57%

[a]A total of 550 mentors completed the survey. Data are not available by model for eight respondents.

[b]This difference is probably a function of the difference in the time when they entered the public school system.

Except for the facts that 32 percent of the tax-levy mentors were retired, as opposed to only 4 percent of the state-funded, there did not seem to be any significant differences between these two groups of mentors.

INTERN PROFILES

The interns were an even more homogenous group, as indicated by their answers to a questionnaire.

Profile of Interns Surveyed by Model, 1988-89[a]

Model	Tax-levy	State-funded
Characteristics	N = 530	N = 106
Percentage With a Common Branch License	22%	25%
Percentage Women	66%	67%
Percentage Teaching Since 1988	75%	81%
Percentage Teaching Since 1987	15%	11%
Percentage With a Bachelor's Degree	80%	70%
Percentage With a Master's Degree	12%	22%

[a]A total of 641 interns completed the survey. Data are not available by model for five respondents.

MENTORS' AND INTERNS' ACTIVITY LOGS

Both mentors and interns maintained daily logs in which they kept track of the nature, topic and role of their M.T.I.P. activities (see Appendices A and B).

The mentors' and interns' most frequent in-school activities were conferencing (defined as "conducting an interchange of views") and viewing/visiting (when "a participant(s) visits a colleague teacher's classroom to view a particular lesson/activity"). Both activities were conducted primarily between mentors and interns, although supervisors and

other colleagues were sometimes involved. The most frequent topics mentioned by the mentors were classroom management, reading, and math. Although the same topics were mentioned by interns, they gave priority to reading and math over classroom management.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For the first time since its inception, the M.T.I.P. was administered by the Board of Education's newly constituted Office of Professional Development and Leadership Training. Overall supervisory responsibility for the program was assumed by a program director. Along with two assistants--one each from the Board and the U.F.T.--the director supervised the work of seven newly recruited regional coordinators who served as liaisons and trouble shooters, and "mentored the mentors" in their assigned districts throughout the five boroughs.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

December, 1988 Conference

A joint all-day orientation conference for mentors and interns was held at Hunter College in Manhattan on December 17 and 18; participants in the program could attend on either of those two days. The point of holding one conference for both mentors and interns (a departure from the original "separate but equal" approach) was, said the program director, "to give them the same message." The conference also helped to dispel the interns' fears that the program had a hidden agenda (having to do with mentors keeping a supervisory eye on them) and as well established a

context in which the interns were familiarized with the mentors' role.

Following a welcome by the Director of the Office of Professional Development and Leadership Training, and greetings by the Director of Educational Programs for the United Federation of Teachers, the program director presented an overview of the M.T.I.P. The keynote address was given by the Executive Vice President of Performance Learning Systems, Inc. In the afternoon small group workshops were held on "empowering questions" and "program aspects," which were led by experienced mentors and program facilitators.

While the participating mentors and interns both rated the conference very highly, the mentors tended to be even more enthusiastic about its quality and helpfulness.

Mentors' and Interns' Ratings of the December, 1988 Conference

Category	Percentage who gave a rating of "good" or "excellent" Mentors	Interns
Overall Quality	94%	85%
Organization	87%	83%
Information Given	80%	71%
Workshop Leader's Knowledge	94%	93%
Workshop Leader's Responsiveness	97%	93%
Quality of Materials	90%	88%
Achievement of Objectives	89%	83%

Ongoing Staff Development

Mentors and interns who took part in staff development workshops and meetings sponsored by the M.T.I.P. between February and May 1989 were asked to evaluate them according to the same criteria they had applied to the December 1988 conference.

Eighty-nine percent of the 1,020 tax-levy mentors and interns and 92 percent of the 185 state-funded mentors and interns who responded said that the overall quality of this ongoing staff development was "good" or "excellent." Specifically, they rated particular aspects of the staff development as indicated in the following table:

Participants' Rating of M.T.I.P. Staff Development Training By Model, 1988-89

Category	Tax-levy	State-funded
Well/very well organized	86%	87%
Information helpful/very helpful	75	72
Leader's knowledge good/ excellent	95	96
Leader's responsiveness good/excellent	95	95
Quality of materials good/ excellent	91	90
Degree to which objectives met good/excellent	91	92

In February, 168 out of the 212 (79 percent) of tax-levy mentors and interns rated the overall quality of staff development as "good" or "excellent"; in May, 150 out of 160 (95 percent) of tax-levy mentors and interns said staff development was "good" or "excellent." State-funded mentors and interns had similar responses: in February, 30 out of 44 (73.1 percent) state-funded mentors and interns rated the overall quality of staff development as "good" or "excellent"; in May, 24 out of 27 (96 percent) state-funded mentors and interns said staff development was "good" or "excellent."

III. FINDINGS OF THE FIRST SURVEY

MENTORS' RESPONSES

A total of 537 mentors, just under half the number participating in the M.T.I.P., responded to the first mentor survey. Over three-fourths of the respondents were tax-levy model mentors; the remaining were state-funded.

The vast majority of these mentors--86 percent--said that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the mentor selection process. An even higher percentage, 90.6 percent) described themselves as "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their interns. Some of the mentors who were not satisfied with their interns blamed the "mismatch" on the selection process, or on the fact that the program's late start had made the interns less receptive to mentoring. Others attributed their interns' unsatisfactoriness to personality problems.

A random sample of 180 responding mentors (120 tax-levy and 60 state-funded) revealed that a great majority of the mentors (88 percent tax-levy and 87 percent state-funded) had applied to be mentors so as "to share their expertise and experience" and, accordingly, most felt they were benefiting from the program personally (93 percent tax-levy, 83 percent state-funded) and professionally (91 percent tax-levy, 80% percent state-funded). Their comments included the following:

- "It is a great pleasure to assist fledgling teachers to develop to the fullest of their potential."
- "I believe that I have come to re-acquire some of the freshness that a new teacher brings to a school. It provides a new impetus."

- "I have further developed some teaching skills by trying to perfect them."

But there were other, less positive responses; nearly all had to do with the fact that, in some schools, the program was not implemented as planned:

- "I had hoped to have a much greater impact on my intern, but because the program has been canceled incessantly, we have had very little actual contact."
- "I will be able to answer [this question] when the program is finally implemented in my school."
- "Because the program has scarcely functioned in our school and began much too late in the school year to be effective, the impact has been minimal..."
- "The program never got off the ground."

Classroom Visits

Seventy-five percent of the tax-levy mentors and 85 percent of those who were state-funded said they enjoyed having new teachers visit their classrooms. However, there were teachers for whom the question was not applicable.

- "I am a retired teacher."
- "In my case I do demos, team teach, and arrange for intervisitations. I haven't been in a classroom situation for years."
- "I am assigned to the library and my program is quite different from a classroom setting."

Absence from the Classroom

In the first two years of the M.T.I.P., the absence of teachers from their classrooms was one of the most controversial aspects of the program, giving rise to dire predictions (on the part of supervisors) about the effect on student performance and creating a strong sense of uneasiness on the part of many

teachers. This year only 11 percent of the tax-levy mentors and 20 percent of the state-funded mentors were opposed to such visits. In each group, there were mentors for whom the question did not apply. For example, one mentor explained, "This year I was a cluster teacher, so it didn't interfere with my regular assignment."

Additional Comments

As was the case in previous years, the most frequently voiced suggestion for improving the program centered around early start-up and planning.

INTERNS' RESPONSES

A total of 493 interns--28 percent of the participants--responded to the first intern survey. Fifty-eight percent of these interns were tax-levy, and 42 percent were state-funded. Nearly 90 percent of the respondents said they had participated in other new teacher staff development programs in addition to the M.T.I.P.

In a random sample of 159 responding interns (99 tax-levy, 60 state-funded), 74 percent tax-levy and 78 percent state-funded, said they felt positively about being interns:

- "I think it is a wonderful initiation into the public school system."
- "It helps in adjusting to the system."

The negative responses had to do with feeling (and perhaps being) overqualified and underestimated.

- "I was given a mentor too late. I was already in the classroom for one year."

- "I worked as an educational assistant for two-and-a- half years. I do not believe that I had to participate in the program as an intern."

- "It came too late. I had already been in the system for seven months when they got around to me."

- "Frankly, other teachers see me as less qualified and less experienced because of the label all of us get."

Some new teachers were pleasantly surprised to discover that being an intern was not what they had expected:

- "At first I was unhappy. I felt 'big brother' would be watching. But instead, all of my interactions have been positive."

- "I was a little surprised because I was teaching for nearly two years, but I have come to appreciate the knowledge I have gained as an intern."

A great majority of the interns sampled said they were benefiting from the M.T.I.P. personally (87 percent tax-levy, 88 percent state-funded) and professionally (93 percent tax-levy, 88 percent state-funded):

- "I've grown so much in the program. I feel part of the system...things have really been working out for me."

"Having someone to talk with was the difference between leaving the profession and sticking it out."

One dissatisfied tax-levy intern said, "My mentor is not an English teacher and is retired and I have no opportunity to view her. Her techniques are antiquated and I got into trouble using one of her lessons. My principal didn't approve...too old fashioned."

However, more than two-thirds of all the interns sampled regarded themselves as "very satisfied" with their mentors:

- "My mentor has gone out of her way to provide the kind of help that I have needed."

- "It is like you're taken by the hand and given everything that you need to teach and not be fearful or lost."

Classroom Visits

Sixty-eight percent of the tax-levy interns and 74 percent of the state-funded teachers gave a positive response to the question, "How do you feel about having a more experienced teacher visit your class to offer assistance and advice?"

- "I like it because it gives me feedback on how I am doing in the classroom."
- "It is helpful. But I must explain that my mentor does not directly advise or assist. She elicits dialogue/ discussion rather than directing."

Interns who were more guarded in their enthusiasm about classroom visits from their mentors commented:

- "At first I was nervous and thought I was being evaluated. When I learned the mentor was to assist the intern, I felt better. I still feel a lot of pressure, though, in the weekly visitations."
- "I am not bothered by it as long as his/her presence is not obtrusive. Also, the children should know he is there to assist only and not to take over."

Interns' Needs

Classroom management, lesson plan development, and discipline/behavior modification were the areas in which the tax-levy interns said they wanted assistance and/or training. These three areas were also important to the state-funded interns, along with teaching reading and doing paperwork/record keeping. The differences between the two groups were striking, especially in light of the fact that they seemed indistinguishable in other respects. In response to the question, "What are some areas/topics in which you would like assistance/training?" they responded in the following way:

Category	Tax-levy	State-funded
Classroom management	23%	13%
Lesson plan development	16%	15%
Discipline/behavior modification	16%	32%
Paperwork/record keeping	6%	10%
Teaching reading	2%	15%

Additional Comments

Again, the most commonly voiced comment came in the form of a suggestion: "Start in September."

IV. SITE VISITS

In the first two years of the M.T.I.P., scheduled visits to selected schools and districts to interview participants and others directly connected to the program provided valuable insights into how men and women (not the categories "mentor," "intern," "supervisor") of the real world, actually worked. Such visits were built into the 1988-89 research design as well. Between March and June, a team of three researchers visited 20 schools--seven state-funded and 13 tax-levy--in 11 districts throughout the five boroughs.

Individual interviews, nearly all of them face-to-face, were conducted with 16 school principals and one assistant principal, 25 mentors, 39 interns, 17 U.F.T. chapter chairpersons, 10 U.F.T. district leaders, and nine district superintendents or their designated representatives in the district office. One district superintendent refused to accept or return calls from the interviewer assigned to the district; as a result no one from that office was interviewed.

As in previous years, the impressionistic portrait which emerged from these site visits does not contradict the "hard facts" based on the survey data, but places them in the social context and gives them meaning. Certain themes that have now become leitmotifs of the M.T.I.P. emerged from these interviews: the supervisors' ambivalence toward a program which they may perceive as jeopardizing their authority yet which they experience as being in their interest (and "good for" experienced and new

teachers and students); the mentors' "second honeymoon" with the teaching profession; the interns' gratitude for the helping hand stretched out to them, albeit belatedly, from 110 Livingston Street and the U.F.T.; the varied relationships that the chapter leaders have with the program; and, given the official attitude of the C.S.A., the unexpected enthusiasm for the program of many in the district office.

PRINCIPALS'/ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS' COMMENTS

Two principals in the same district, both implementing the tax-levy model, said:

- "My role is minimal because of time--I wasn't asked to sit on the advisory committee."
- "I was anxious to ensure that the time [mentors and interns] spent together focused on achieving certain goals--I had input into the direction of their meeting. I discussed this with the mentor." (The intern at this school, however, said the principal "didn't have a role--it's between the mentor and me and it's confidential.")

Other principals commented:

- "My role was administering the program. The participants do the job okay, so why should I put pressure on them? I think it is wonderful that teachers are participating in teaching teachers." (However, the mentor in this school said, "More and more I was used by the principal for other activities--administrative--in particular the last weeks. I found it very hard to say no.")
- "The reality of it is that it is not a good thing. We have an on-site staff developer, a staff resource person, and a mentor. This is overkill. [The program] is redundant. Staff development should be done by a licensed supervisor. Scheduling is a nightmare."
- "It is a valuable device but impossible to function effectively. It interrupts the daily flow of the classrooms. We need to bring in trained retired supervisors. I'd like to have a seat at the top levels [next year] to take away some power from the U.F.T. The mentor idea hasn't been thought out. Right now it is in pieces. There should be more input from principals." (This was said by a principal who didn't know which mentoring model the school was using.)

- "I did not like the program, in particular for the intern involved. She did not need it. The school offers staff development by the supervisors; on the district level there are special trainings for speech teachers. The mentor program--as it was organized--is not helpful. I did not have a role in the program; that is part of the problem. I knew who really needed it. The way it happened was administrative. On paper the intern needed to be mentored, but she was already at the school for a while and did very well."

- "I feel more positive than I did in the beginning. I definitely see an improvement in new teachers."

- "I was a member of the selection committee. I tried to encourage the best matches and get the best qualified mentors...I trusted the mentors. Contact with administration is necessary. Otherwise, how do you know what the mentors are doing? How do you know that periods set aside for mentoring are used as such? I know that not all of them did. The program is designed as anti-supervisor." (Asked about the principal's role vis a vis the M.T.I.P., one intern in this school said, "They don't have a role. No one checks. I never saw them.")

- "The mentor program is in fact the strongest part of the staff development program. Teachers get some assistance from the supervisors. There is a teacher trainer for three days supplied by the Special Ed. office. But there was a definite need for such a program. It filled a gap."

MENTORS' COMMENTS

Participating mentors made the following comments:

- "If we are going to be treated as professionals, they have to make the conditions as such. Otherwise, nobody is willing to do it."

- "Being a mentor has taught me to become a better observer--to be more understanding of what is going on with different children. I take notes--to be very precise in what was wrong and what went well. I became more effective. I learned from observing [the intern] to be more specific in my own lessons, in particular to motivate specific kids. It forces you to make sure not to make the same mistakes and to teach very self-consciously because the intern is watching."

- "The program gives me a chance to organize my thoughts about my own experience as a teacher because I have to get it across to somebody else. It is enlightening. I've learned to be tactful so that the intern does not feel judged and evaluated. I enjoy teaching more."

- "The program has made me refine my teaching skills, to reflect more on my work and be more thoughtful about how and why I do things."

- "I am more self-conscious about what I am doing, understand more the things I took for granted. I ask myself: 'What is it that I do that is different?' 'How can it be transferred?'"

- "After all the work this year, one of the two interns is being excessed!...All teachers that need mentoring should get it, not only those teachers whose certificates indicate it. It is a wonderful program."

INTERNS' COMMENTS

As in the first two years, the interns appreciated the M.T.I.P. both for the new skills they learned and for the feelings it engendered: increased self-confidence and a sense of community. This was true for virtually all the new teachers--the majority who welcomed the program with open arms, and even those who thought they already knew what they were doing. They made the following comments:

- "I didn't have student teaching and I knew I needed it. The mentor made specific suggestions that she uses in her classroom that I incorporated into mine. I got so much more work done."

- "The mentor has been very helpful in trying to ind information and materials necessary for the different levels. She also helped me to understand the specific problems of the kids and helped me to make a lesson plan...I am more intimate with the students. I am more confident. There is a better understanding between student and teacher. I know them better. For new teachers the program is incredibly helpful."

- "At the beginning I was skeptical. I had teaching experience and I wasn't interested in the program much. My interest and willingness have changed...tremendously. There are many things a new teacher needs to know. You need to have someone to ask."

But there were some disagreements. One intern remarked:

- "I was not interested. I had worked a whole year already and had set my schedule and style of teaching. I wasn't willing to change that. And I didn't. I felt it was more an

intrusion than a help. I did not want to give up free periods for conferences with my mentor."

U.F.T. CHAPTER LEADERS' COMMENTS

The assessment of the program by the U.F.T. chapter leaders was positive in most cases. They made the following comments:

- "Off the record--this sort of thing is done all the time, but we don't always have the freedom to do it during the day."
- "We have a tremendous amount of new personnel; the program is giving them a helping hand."
- "The children in the intern's class have more self-control. They are also more responsive academically and more confident...It's a good program."
- "Anything that helps young teachers is worthwhile."

But their perception of their role vis a vis the program varied considerably. Some were very actively involved and described their role:

- "To oversee and lend support. To handle complaints."
- "Facilitating and initiating the program. I fought for mentoring time."
- "Liaison between the mentor and intern."

Others, afraid that the M.T.I.P. represented a plot by the U.F.T. to take over the schools, knew almost nothing about the program, including which mentoring model was being used in their schools.

U.F.T. DISTRICT LEADERS' COMMENTS

This is the first year that the voice of the U.F.T. district leaders has been heard in the evaluation. They made the following comments:

- "It's affected the morale of veteran teachers. They saw it as a mark of respect...People who are new but not uncertified are jealous [of the interns]. They can't understand why they're not getting help...The concept of new teachers

getting help is universally supported [but] principals who are top down managers have a hard time with it, particularly confidentiality." (This was said by a district leader who sits on the Mentor Advisory Selection committee and described herself as having "a very strong role" in the program.)

- "There is a built-in resistance to the program. The principals complain that there are difficulties in programming. I haven't met with the interns...I figure it is working well. I view myself as a union rep--a liaison with the chapter leaders rather than someone who is part of the mentoring structure...I sit on the [M.A.S.] committee. It doesn't meet on a regular basis."

- "The program has had little effect in the district. The person in charge of the district was incompetent. She tried to manipulate the [M.A.S.] committee...Mentors and interns don't have faith in the program. When you have a full time mentor, the interns don't have a class to visit. Also, the mentor forgets what it is like to teach! The concept is destroyed. In this district, it is an administrative program."

DISTRICT OFFICERS' COMMENTS

According to one principal, "the district office has no real desire to see it [the program] work--to see it happen, philosophically, educationally. They're not tied to it at all."

The district officers made the following comments:

- "Both mentor and intern like it. It has a positive impact. For students it is helpful in the long run because it sharpens the skills of teachers in the program. In the short run it is problematic because of insufficient and unqualified replacement. The district needs to have the responsibility for implementing the program; the district needs options. The rigid rules of the Central Board are holding back a fast implementation. For example, have fewer conference hours for the mentor and intern during school time and additional hours after school (paid), which would make it much easier in this district."

- "The mentor/intern structure is too heavy handed. The relationship is too formal. The program's underlying goal is to give power to certain teachers to influence education."

- "There has been a positive effect of the program on the district in that the philosophy behind the program is great."

- "The goals and objectives of the program are wonderful but much ironing out of problems needs to occur."

V. SUMMING UP: FINDINGS OF THE END-OF-YEAR SURVEY

In addition to the second survey sent to mentors and interns, school principals, Mentor Advisory Selection committee members, U.F.T. district representatives, and District Office representatives were also surveyed towards the end of the 1988-89 school year.

MENTORS' RESPONSES

A total of 414 mentors (291 tax-levy and 93 state-funded) responded to the second mentor survey.

Surveyed Mentors' Time Allotments, By Model, 1988-89

Category	Tax-levy (N = 291)	State-funded (N = 93)
School Has an Overall Staff Development Program	54%	52%
School Staff Dvlpmt Program "Effective" or "Very Effective"	33%	25%
Three Release Periods per Intern	22%	54%
Five Release Periods per Intern	78%	46%
Working with Intern Since February 1989	70%	79%
Working with Intern Since April 1989 or Later	13%	12%

By the end of the school year a great majority of the mentors had a high regard for the M.T.I.P.; this positive assessment was more marked among the state-funded mentors.

Mentors' Ratings of M.T.I.P., By Model, 1988-89

	Percentage Who Gave the Program a Rating of "Helpful" or "Very Helpful"	
	Model	
Category	Tax-levy	State-funded
Expansion of Knowledge of Teaching Strategies	78%	88%
Expansion of Knowledge of Students' Learning Styles	60%	65%
Increasing Self-Confidence	74%	75%
Increasing Repertoire of Teaching Techniques	74%	81%
Improving Morale	83%	82%
Clarifying the Value of Their Work	82%	82%
Meeting a Need for Support and Growth	76%	74%

A random sample of 180 mentors (120 tax-levy and 60 state-funded) responded to the second mentor survey. Thirty-seven percent of the tax-levy mentors, compared with 47 percent of the state-funded mentors, perceived the role of the principal and

other school supervisory staff to be positive. Following are some of their comments:

- "The principal is very supportive; she sees a great deal of value in this program and thinks it will be beneficial to both mentor and intern."
- "The principal...spent time setting up appropriate scheduling as he believes in the program's philosophy."

Thirty percent of the tax-levy mentors and 25 percent% of the state-funded mentors in this sample viewed the role of the principal and other supervisory staff negatively:

- "The principal sees the program as a threat."
- "The principal didn't think highly of the program."

Asked to make suggestions for improving the program, the two groups of mentors were unusually divergent:

Surveyed Mentors' Suggestions for Program Improvement, 1988-89

Suggestions	Percentage Advocating Improvement	
	Tax-levy	State-funded
Begin in September	22%	38%
Improve Scheduling and flexibility	7%	24%
Arrange Common Coverage Periods for Mentor and Intern	14%	-
Allow More Time To Meet and Plan	20%	-
Plan More Workshops	41%	26%
Plan More Meetings and Conferences	2%	13%
Organize More Staff Development and Training	42%	28%
Make More resources available	42%	23%

Fifty-six percent of the state-funded mentors, as opposed to only 14 percent of the tax-levy mentors, made no suggestions for improving the program. From the nature of the suggestions that were made, it seems that the state-funded mentors were generally more satisfied with the program as a whole but dissatisfied with scheduling; the tax-levy mentors, satisfied with the program's logistics, felt that the content of the program needed to be improved.

INTERNS' RESPONSES

A total of 411 interns (276 tax-levy and 106 state-funded) responded to the second intern survey. Three-quarters of the tax-levy respondents (73 percent) and the state-funded respondents (74 percent) described the program as "helpful" or "very helpful" in developing effective teaching behaviors.

Effective Teaching Behaviors

Some of their comments are listed below:

- "The mentor helped me find a variety of teaching materials that I was able to use in the classroom."
- "The program helped me change my teaching style...I am now spending more time on one subject to make sure that the students fully grasp the information."
- "I'm now a more enthusiastic teacher. I'm trying out new ideas in the classroom to get the students involved more."
- "It has helped me to take a calmer approach to discipline."
- "Implementing lesson plans and effectively carrying them out."
- "I learned how to evaluate my teaching results so that I can adjust my teaching strategy."

Both groups of interns were equally positive about other benefits derived from the program: 76 percent of the tax-levy interns and 73 percent of those who were state-funded said that the M.T.I.P. had been "helpful" or "very helpful" to them in developing self confidence.

Seventy-seven percent of the tax-levy interns and 75 percent of those who were state-funded said that the program had been "helpful" or "very helpful" to them in developing the perception that their work was valued by others.

Seventy-two percent of the tax-levy interns and 68 percent of the state-funded interns planned to stay in their current assignments in 1989-90.

A random sample of 180 interns (120 tax-levy and 60 state-funded) responded to the second intern survey. Forty-nine percent of the tax-levy interns, compared with 68 percent of those who were state-funded, perceived the role of the principal and other school supervisory staff vis a vis the M.T.I.P. in a positive light, although there was considerable diversity of opinion on the content of the role:

- "My principal was extremely helpful and quite interested in the progress of the program. He kept abreast of our progress and was quite flexible in scheduling both our programs."
- "Other than making it possible for new teachers to have mentors, they didn't have any input into the program. They have no role and that should remain thus."

Those in the sample who perceived the role of the principal and other supervisory staff negatively (32 percent tax-levy and 18 percent state-funded) explained:

- "The administration assumes a distant role. They were not even willing to release me from any of my teaching periods.

Nor was there any contact on the matter of mentoring by any member of the administration."

- "Very resentful and hypocritical. Their interest goes as far as they can get extra funding for their school."
- "The principal has not given any assistance. I think he believes that because there is a mentor, he does not have to do anything with me."

However, one tax-levy intern pointed out, "The principal hasn't been cooperative in any aspect. The assistant principal on the other hand, has been truly supportive."

Although the M.T.I.P. has been charged occasionally with representing a "plot" to take over the schools (an extreme form of the criticism voiced by some administrators and supervisors that the program undermines existing school-based supervisory and training structures), the interns' perception of the role played by the U.F.T. chapter leaders vis a vis the program did not support this suspicion. Thirty-six percent of the tax-levy interns and 22 percent of those who were state-funded viewed the U.F.T. role positively:

- "The chapter leader has been the main force in support of the program."
- "She was on the selection committee and helped me switch mentors when I had a problem with the first."

One-third of the tax-levy interns and 47 percent of the state-funded interns viewed the role played by their U.F.T. chapter leader in a negative light:

- "I experienced her one-sidedness on issues and problems stemming from her own resentment of the bilingual program. When I was being harassed she said 'Don't lose any sleep over it' and that was it."
- "I didn't know that the U.F.T. chapter leader was at all involved or supposed to be involved in this program. It was never brought up in any of our conversations."

- "She tried somewhat to convince the principle to provide mentors,but she didn't push very hard."
- "I didn't know she had a part in the program."

One fourth of the interns in both groups suggested that the program start in September.

PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES

Only one school principal returned the survey.

MENTOR ADVISORY SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS' RESPONSES

A total of 183 people responded to the survey sent to M.A.S. committee members. They included 113 teachers, 52 school supervisors, 12 district office personnel, and six U.F.T. district representatives.

Ninety-five percent defined the committee's role in terms of interviewing prospective mentors and recommending the best candidates; 16 percent attributed to the committee a troubleshooting job as well (to review implementation, develop strategies to improve implementation, and facilitate the resolution of problems). Forty percent of those responding said the program had had a positive effect on the district:

- "It improved the quality of first-year teachers."
- "It has helped focus on the need to give new teachers help A.S.A.P."
- "It resulted in greater retention of teachers."

Sixty-two percent said the program had a positive effect on interns, and one committee member said, "Until now it was 'sink or swim.' This program is the life preserver that carries the intern to shore."

Sixty-five percent said the program had a positive effect on mentors:

- "Mentors reassessed their own skills and improved while creating a nurturing professional environment."
- "Mentors (especially retirees) did not have to put their skills out to pasture."

Only 35 percent thought the program had had a positive effect on other staff in schools in their district (65 percent did not respond to this question). One respondent said, "A greater awareness that experienced teachers have a special value and skills that can be helpful when shared."

Fifty-three percent of the M.A.S. committee members who responded said that the M.T.I.P. had a positive effect on students. One respondent commented, "It is a positive influence when teachers model the cooperative spirit in their schools. Perhaps it will help to expand peer tutoring among schools and expand their collaborative skills."

Forty-four percent thought the program had a positive effect on supervisors:

- "It relieved them of the job of helping new teachers to some extent."
- "The program wasn't well received at first, but now there's been a complete turnaround."

Twenty-five percent thought the program had a negative effect on supervisors:

- "Most express desires to see this program fail. They fear that the mentors will replace them as supervisors. They see the relationship of interns and mentor teachers as disruptive to their program. They view these persons as intruding into their domain. The CSA [Council of Supervisors and Administrators] in the district uses the program to rally a lobbying effort against such programs."

- "Supervisor used the substitute hired to free mentor illegally."

The most common suggestion for improving the program (from 35% percent of the respondents) was to start the program early in the school year.

Asked to make additional comments on the M.T.I.P., M.A.S. committee members said:

- "The program created the personnel stability we needed."
- "The concept is excellent. It could well prevent the wholesale turnover of staff that plagues our district every year."
- "Too disruptive to a school. Teachers should be required to enter teaching with proper training and credentials."
- "It is poorly planned and executed with regard to staffing and programming problems facing a NYC high school. As such, it adds little to the improvement of instruction or teacher training."
- "I can see the need for the program on the elementary school and the junior high school level, where proper supervision is lacking. In high school, the major role of the A.P. supervisor is to work with and train the teaching personnel to become effective teachers."
- "Insist that mentors and staff developers become school-based and model themselves through teaching. We have too many educators outside the classroom already. If they serve as examples, then why aren't they teaching?"

U.F.T. DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES' RESPONSES

Eleven U.F.T. district representatives, including leaders from two of the city's five high school districts, responded to the survey.

The most positive effect of the program, as they saw it, was on the mentors and interns themselves:

- "Interns are receptive and eager to have more experienced colleagues offer guidance and assistance. They genuinely seem to appreciate the program."

- "[The mentors] enjoy the program--it's evident by their applying in almost every case for next year."

These leaders had mixed feelings about the effects of the program on other staff:

- "As a rule, they see this program as a major step forward. They are very much aware that they never received this type of assistance."
- "They're disenchanted by the failure to select in-service teachers."
- "No impact."

As for the effects of the program on school supervisors, most of the leaders thought they had been mixed--at best. One respondent said, "On the one hand, it assisted their staff development effort. On the other hand the imposition of the program was cumbersome and caused programmatic problems."

Ten of the 11 U.F.T. district representatives responding to the survey were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the mentor selection process. Explained one, "The mentors were chosen by a teacher-weighted committee. As a result, teacher input could not be totally disregarded and the most respected and accomplished teachers were often chosen."

Another union leader said, "The deputy superintendent was unanimously chosen to be chairperson [of the M.A.S. committee] since the program's inception. He has been a marvelous, wonderful chairman and because of his labors the program has been more successful than anyone imagined possible for a new program."

But another warned, "The most difficult problem is changing the attitude of the administration, specifically the Superintendent...What is apparent is that in those districts where

delay and confusion are used as weapons to destroy the program, some official action must be taken."

DISTRICT OFFICERS' RESPONSES

Twelve district office personnel--one district superintendent, three deputy superintendents, seven district office liaisons to the M.T.I.P., and one high school district superintendent liaison--responded to the survey sent to district office personnel.

They viewed the role of the M.A.S. committee in the same light as committee members who had responded to the survey: "an advisory and policy-setting group."

The overall assessment of the program on the part of these administrators was positive:

- "It produced a much more stable staff."
- "Retirees are pleased to be of assistance in the program. School staff mentors enjoyed their roles--extended themselves beyond the guidelines."
- "It gave the supervisor the time needed to train other teachers not involved in the program."
- "What originally was a negative reaction at being excluded has been tempered with the reality that the program works."

But the M.T.I.P. was no bed of roses in their view:

- "[It created] polarization between U.F.T. and C.S.A."
- "[Principals have] some concern...about using 'active' teachers as opposed to retirees because it takes away from the mentor's regular teaching time."

These district officers also made the following suggestions:

- "Give principal and chapter chairperson more input into the mentor selection process."
- "Encourage the best teachers to mentor. Many do not want to leave their classes."

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In a national survey of 2,000 teachers done in May and June of 1989, 53 percent said they were respected; in 1984 only 47 percent had said they felt that way*. The New York Times reported on the study under the headline: "Teachers Taking More Pride in Profession, Survey Finds." Meanwhile, the front page headline of New York Newsday on a recent Sunday asked, "Do the Kids have a Chance? City Schools Earn a 'D' for Disaster."

Is there a connection between teachers' sense of professionalism and student achievement? The Mentor Teacher Internship Program, initiated as a pilot project three years ago in a number of jurisdictions throughout the state, reflects an official acknowledgement that the public school system, like many of the students it serves, is "at risk"; as well, it reflects a recognition on the part of the State Legislature, State Education Department, the Board of Education, and the United Federation of Teachers that mentoring--non-evaluative, on-site peer coaching--plays a positive role in remedying two crucial symptoms of the condition by raising the level of professional competence among new teachers and raising retention rates. The program embodies the commitment of the Board of Education to provide support to uncertified teachers who have been hired to teach in the public education system.

---

*The sixth annual telephone survey of American teachers conducted by Louis Harris and Associates for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

The evidence of this year's evaluation of the M.T.I.P.--both the state-funded and tax-levy models--tended to bear out the highly favorable conclusions drawn from the evaluations of the program during its first two years: almost unanimously, teachers--new and experienced--deeply appreciated the program and attributed to it a renewed commitment to and satisfaction with their profession as well as the development of their teaching skills; the majority of supervisors--regardless of their philosophical orientation or leadership styles--paid tribute to the contribution which the program made to teaching excellence; the majority of administrators at the district office level--regardless of the logistical "headaches" the program may have entailed--perceived the program to be of benefit to students, teachers, other school staff and supervisors themselves; the majority of U.F.T. representatives at both the school and district level--regardless of the extent to which they were critical of program implementation--regarded it in a favorable light.

At the same time, it is clearer than ever that the M.T.I.P. is not a panacea for what ails public education in New York City. In fact (and this has been apparent since the 1986-87 pilot project) the program tends to spotlight problems--such as low student achievement and teacher "burnout"--that have become endemic in the schools. These problems, which are themselves ultimately traceable to the social and economic conditions that increasingly characterize New York and other cities, get played out so dramatically in the schools because, ironically, it is children who bear the brunt of them.

Of course, these conditions will not be transformed by merely administrative and/or quantitative solutions (a few more dollars, a few more hours) which concerned officials often promise will "do the trick." The Mentor Teacher Internship Program is not intended, nor is it able, to address the city's mammoth problems as they are expressed in the smaller arena of a particular school or district.

Yet there was a tendency, born of frustration, of cynicism, of not-knowing-what-to-do, for everyone involved--teachers, principals, district representatives, district office personnel--to speak as if the program could, or should be able to, do what no program could possibly do. The fact is that even if the M.T.I.P.'s every "kink"--from lack of coverage to lack of cooperation--were ironed out, the program is limited in what it can accomplish by the larger social framework in which it is located. It is from the perspective that only within these limits can the success of the M.T.I.P. (or any other program) be assessed that the following conclusions and recommendations are made.

In 1988-89--the third year of its implementation--the program is widely accepted, "for better or for worse," as part of the education system's environment. New York City's public schools have "settled down" with the Mentor Teacher Internship Program in what appears to be a permanent relationship. The exhilaration of the first year has given way to satisfaction, familiarity, and a tolerance for the program's quirks ("too much paperwork") and foibles ("it's a wonderful idea but it needs to start in September").

There remains a residue of die-hard opposition to mentoring--most of it from C.S.A. "hard-liners" and superintendents who insist that the training of new teachers is the exclusive responsibility (and prerogative) of supervisors. But serious quarrels with the philosophy that underlies the program, or with its actual practice, are rare. As one principal noted, "The C.S.A. is really just using the program as a pretext to wage a turf war with the U.F.T. The reality is that mentors don't encroach on our territory: we're still the supervisors, we're the ones who have the authority to hire and fire, not the mentors. Frankly, if they're going to pay teachers to train other teachers for me, I'll take it."

But real issues and concerns do remain. The appreciation of the interns for the program was tempered, in many cases, by the realization that their first weeks and months as teachers had been unnecessarily difficult because they felt they were left to flounder when a mentor could have been working with them from the start of the school year in September. "The legislative mandate is there; the funding is there; the mentor selection advisory committee is there; the new teachers are there," said one U.F.T. chapter leader, "so what's the problem?"

Earlier participants in the M.T.I.P. repeatedly cited the scarcity in many districts of competent and reliable substitute coverage. In 1988-89, the concern over regular teachers' absence from their classrooms seemed to have dissipated somewhat with experience; the dire predictions about the traumatic effects on student discipline and performance have simply not been borne out.

Structurally, the concern was addressed by the tax-levy model, which allows for the hiring of retired teachers as mentors as well as of full-time mentors. This solution, however, bred other problems: in the case of retired teacher mentors who were perceived as being "out of touch" with current classroom situations and teaching methodology; and in the case of "class-less" full-time mentors who could not model in their own classroom settings what they were telling their interns to do. The tax-levy full-time mentor is required one class per day in order to address this issue.

The following recommendations are based on suggestions for improving the M.T.I.P. made by mentors, interns, U.F.T. chapter leaders, school principals and assistant principals, U.F.T. district representatives, and district office personnel on written surveys and in the course of personal interviews.

State-funded vs. Tax-levy Models. Since there is no discernible indication that one or the other model is "better" than the other, schools/districts should continue to have the option to choose the one which best suits their needs.

Confidentiality. When mentors were asked about the "first steps" to take with interns, they frequently cited the confidential nature of the relationship as a major factor in establishing trust. Despite the fact that some principals continued to bristle at the mere idea that anything could go on in their schools without their knowledge, the confidential relationship between mentors and interns should be preserved and strengthened; everyone concerned should be apprised of the fact

that confidentiality is stipulated in the legislation and "that is that."

Intern Selection. While there is general satisfaction with the mentor selection process, a significant number of people involved in the program felt that the identification of interns should not be made solely on the basis of objective criteria, but that the judgment of the principal and chapter leader should also be taken into account. While the inclusion of subjective criteria in determining which teachers would benefit most from mentoring carries with it the risk that some teachers will feel stigmatized by virtue of their intern status, principals and chapter leaders should have the authority to jointly prioritize that particular teachers who fit the official definition of "uncertified" should be served first.

Regional coordinators. In 1986-87 the two regional coordinators, working under the program director, maintained a hands-on relationship to the M.T.I.P. which put them on a first-name basis with virtually everyone connected with the program. Their personal support and enthusiasm served as a model of mentoring theory and practice. The program has grown exponentially since then, and the regional coordinators cannot be expected to maintain the same connection to the program as the "first generation" of coordinators. Given the program expansion, it would be worthwhile to re-examine the role of the regional coordinators, so that they most effectively provide assistance and support to program participants.

Early implementation. The joint investment of resources into the M.T.I.P. on the part of the state, city, and teachers' union constitutes the strongest argument for early implementation. If mentoring is needed--and there is near-unanimity that it is--then it is needed most when new teachers are newest. The program should be monitored closely for compliance, and districts must program in Spring to insure early September start-up.

Retired Teachers. To solve the problems bred by the hiring of retired teacher mentors, the M.T.I.P. should consider providing an orientation program for retirees which explains the purposes of the program and offers strategies for effective mentoring. In addition, the program should enforce the criterion that only teachers who have been retired from serving as a classroom teacher for no more than five years are eligible to be selected as mentors. The Mentor Advisory Selection Committees should consider the issue of whether retired mentors should serve as coverage teachers so they could have classes to model instruction in.

APPENDIX A

For the purposes of coding, mentors and interns could describe their activities in the following terms:

Conferencing, in which the participants conduct an interchange of views;

Consulting, in which one or more participants is asked to provide advice or an opinion of a particular problem(s) to be solved;

Designing/Developing, in which participants create an instructional method, curriculum package, curriculum plans, instructional materials, or new uses for materials or technologies;

Distributing, which occurs when materials, pamphlets, books, newsletters, etc. are sent to participant(s) and the user(s) are informed of the substance of the materials sent;
Facilitating, in which a participant makes arrangements, appointments, and/or visitations possible for the person(s) involved;

Informing, in which a participant provides information of a specific kind on a specific topic;

Locating, in which a participant finds materials, information, ideas, and/or plans for a particular need;

Networking, in which a participant(s) shares and/or exchanges ideas for the purpose of interacting with professionals outside one's normal realm of experience;

Preparing/Planning, in which a participant manages the organization of other activities so that they are coherently related and integrated;

Relationship Building, in which participants work together towards strengthening trust, confidence, security, and positive attitudes;

Training, in which special activities are conducted for the purpose of improving a teacher's skills; to introduce different strategies or the use of a particular curriculum; and

Viewing/Visiting, in which a participant(s) visits a colleague teacher's classroom to view a particular lesson/activity.

APPENDIX B

For purposes of coding, the following were identified as possible "topics" of M.T.I.P. activities:

Art
Classroom Management
Computing
Dealing with Parents
Discipline
English as a Second Language
Foreign Language
Library
Math
Music
Other Language Arts
Physical/Health Education
Procedural Items
Reading
Reasoning Skills
Report Cards
Science
Social Studies
Student Records
Testing/Teacher Made
Test Construction
Writing
Strategies
Program Aspects
Equipment
Materials
Proposal Writing
Supervisory Observation
Student Performance
Learning Centers
Bulletin Boards
Homework
U.F.T. Matters
Training/Meeting